

*D2*  
*Con 1*

a plurality of second electrodes, one such second electrode corresponding to each OLED, each of said second electrodes comprising an isolated conducting area in contact with said light emitting layer, said light emitting layer generating light of said first wavelength in a region adjacent to said second electrode when a potential difference is applied across said first and second electrodes, wherein said isolation transistors are part of an array of transistors on a substrate that is separate from said flexible array of OLEDs.

#### REMARKS

The Examiner rejected Claim 3 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dingwall (5,903,246) in view of Gu, *et al.* (hereafter “Gu”)(5,844,363). Applicant traverses this rejection. Dingwall teaches an OLED array constructed by depositing the various OLED layers on a glass substrate containing a preformed transistor array. Gu teaches an OLED array constructed by depositing the various OLED layers on a flexible substrate. Neither reference teaches or suggests that one could form two separate arrays, one of transistors and one of OLEDs and then bond the two arrays together. The above amendments to Claims 3 and 8 emphasize this difference.

In addition, Applicant notes that the Examiner argues that the motivation for combining the teachings of Dingwall and Gu is to provide lightweight, portable, roll-up displays and conformable displays. Applicant submits that no one of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to combine these references for these reasons, since one would need to have a flexible version of the transistor array taught in Dingwall for such a combination to provide a flexible display. Dingwall teaches that the transistor array is constructed on a glass substrate prior to the deposition of the OLEDs on that substrate. Replacing the deposited OLEDs with a flexible sheet having an OLED array thereon would not lead to a flexible display. Furthermore, absent the teachings of the present invention, it is not clear how one would bond the two together to provide reliable connections to each pixel.

The Examiner rejected claim 8 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dingwall (5,903,246) in view of Bulovic, *et al* (hereafter, “Bulovic”) (5,834,893). Applicant traverses this rejection. As noted above, Dingwall does not disclose a device in which the

OLEDs are constructed on one substrate and the driving transistors on a second substrate, no less a flexible substrate. While Bulovic discloses that one can deposit the OLEDs taught therein on a flexible substrate, there is no teaching of combining an OLED array on a first substrate with a transistor array on a second substrate. Like Dingwall, Bulovic teaches that the OLEDs taught therein can be deposited on a transistor array.

I hereby certify that this paper (along with any others attached hereto) is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail with sufficient postage on the date signed below in an envelope addressed to: Hon. Assistant Commissioner of Patents, Box Amendment, Washington, D.C. 20231.

Respectfully Submitted,



Calvin B. Ward  
Registration No. 30,896  
Date signed and mailed: January 12,2001

IP Administration  
Legal Dept., M/S 51UPD  
AGILENT TECHNOLOGIES  
P.O. Box 58043  
Santa Clara, CA 95052-8043  
Telephone (925) 855-0413  
Telefax (925) 855-9214